

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1-3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader (US 2002/0166123) in view of Nejime (US 7,272,843) and Dureau (US 7,634,795). It is respectfully submitted, however, that Applicants' claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1, includes features which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

... a mobile data terminal management unit managing information of the mobile data terminal to which the restructured program content should be outputted ...

... the mobile data terminal management unit manages information of the mobile data terminal and further, transmits to the mobile data terminal, metadata for the video operation menu corresponding to the mobile data terminal, and then realizes a video operation menu on the mobile data terminal ...

In accordance with an exemplary embodiment of the present invention, Applicants' mobile data terminal management unit has two functions, one of them is to manage information of the mobile data terminal, and the other of the functions is to transmit to the mobile data terminal metadata for the video operation menu corresponding to the mobile data terminal and then realizes a video operation menu on the mobile data terminal. Transmitting metadata to the mobile data terminal is important because the metadata is for the video operation menu and is imbedded so that an operational command is transmitted to the mobile data terminal when the display of the metadata is selected. That is to say, the metadata for the video operation menu has a function to command an operation at the mobile data terminal.

At Column 8, lines 18-36, Dureau discloses the following:

For example, receiver 340 may be configured to receive a television audio/video signal and convey the received

signal to television 357. However, in addition to conveying the signal to television receiver 340 may be configured to automatically transcode the signal to a format compatible with PDEA 352E and continuously transmit the transcoded signal in parallel with the television signal. In such an embodiment, a viewer may be watching television, leave the room, and still keep up with the television program by carrying PDA 352E.

In contrast with the above, Applicants metadata for the video operation menu, which is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record. Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Claims 2 and 3 are patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Nejime, Dureaym, and Shteyn (US 2002/0144007). Claim 4, however, is patentable by virtue of its dependency on allowable claim 1.

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view Nejime, Dureau, Shteyn and Kinno (US 2003/0154217). This claim, however, is patentable by virtue of its dependency on allowable claim 1.

Claim 6 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dimitrova in view of Dureau. Again, however, Dureau lacks Applicants' claimed "metadata" feature. Accordingly, Applicants' claim 6 is patentable over the art of record.

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Nejime, Dureau and Kinno. Claim 10 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Nejime, Dureau, Shteyn, Kinno and Gardere (US 6,678,332). Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Nejime, Dureau, Shteyn, Kinno, Gardere and Zander (US 6,360,218). Claims 12 and 15 have

Application No.: 10/594,774  
Amendment Dated: August 24, 2011  
Reply to Office Action of: May 24, 2011

KAN-113US

been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Nejime, Dureau, Shteyn, Kinno, Gardere, Zander and Munetsugu (US 7,134,074). Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Nejime, Dureau, Hoshino (US 2004/0249861) and Munetsugu. These claims are all patentable by virtue of their dependency on allowable claim 1.

Claims 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Nejime, Dimitrova (US 2006/0041915) and Dureau. Again, the prior art of record lacks Applicants' claimed "metadata" feature. Thus, claim 16 is patentable over the art of record. Claim 17 is patentable by virtue of its dependency on allowable claim 16.

Claim 18 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schrader in view of Dimitrova. Neither of these references, however, include Applicants' claimed "metadata" feature. Accordingly, claim 18 is patentable over the art of record.

This application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515  
Attorney for Applicants

LEA/dmw

Dated: August 24, 2011

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

1346532